

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Nick Warren
Legal &
Compliance/Intellectual
Forskargränd 8
721 78 Västerås
Sverige

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	26-04-2005
-------------------------------------	------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference 9595WO/AT/MZ		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/IB2004/004177	International filing date (day/month/year) 17-12-2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 23-12-2003	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G05B9/02			
Applicant ABB Research Ltd et al			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. 051023 ✓

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE Patent- och registreringsverket Box 5055 S-102 42 STOCKHOLM	Authorized officer Henrik Eriksson/MN
Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88	Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/004177

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/004177

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>2-21, 23-26</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1, 22, 27</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u></u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-27</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-27</u>	YES
	Claims	<u></u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The claimed invention relates to a method in an industrial safety system for controlling a process or equipment. The control system enables signals to be generated as a result of an event or an alarm. An automated link between the event or alarm and an action to be taken upon receipt of said event or alarm signal due to the event is created. The claimed method reduces the chance of introducing human error in design.

Documents cited in the International Search Report:

D1: NL 1016345 C2	D4: WO 9704463 A1
D2: US 5054023 A	D5: EP 0482523 A2
D3: US 20020169514 A1	D6: US 5361198 A

Documents D4-D6 represent the general state of the art.

Document D1 discloses a safety system where equipment is monitored and controlled (see English abstract). The system comprises components with safety devices and the status of the equipment is continuously monitored. An automatic link is created between certain events and actions to be taken upon receipt of said event. For example, the equipment is switched off if the temperature is too high. The invention according to D1 probably also contains a computer, a

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/004177

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: BOX V

computer program and a graphical user interface.

Document D2 discloses a method for monitoring a process (abstract). Signals are generated as a result of an alarm and an action is initiated.

Document D3 discloses a graphical user interface for controlling industrial processes. Information about the status of the processes is collected (section [0012]) and corrective measures are automatically taken if problems are detected (claim 1). The user interface graphically illustrates the components in the process and further, the interface illustrates the relations between the components (section [0106] and fig.8). The components and the relations can be altered or changed in a graphical model (sections [0106] and [0134]).

The invention according to claims 1, 22 and 27 is so generally formulated that it is disclosed by documents D1 and D2.

Consequently, the invention according to claims 1, 22 and 27 is already known from D1 and D2 and therefore lacks novelty.

Further, the invention according to claims 1, 22 and 27 is also considered to lack an inventive step in the light of document D3.

Document D3 is considered to represent the closest prior art to the invention according to claim 17. The difference between the invention according to claim 17 and D3 is that it concerns a process or equipment in an industrial safety system. However, the invention according to D3 could be used to model many different parts (see abstract).

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/004177

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: BOX V

A person skilled in the art, who wants a graphical user interface for controlling a process or equipment in an industrial safety system, realizes that the interface disclosed in D3 could be used for that purpose. This modification of D3 is considered as obvious to the skilled person. The modification of D3 results in an interface according to claim 17.

The invention according to claim 17 is thus not considered to involve an inventive step.

Since the method lacks an inventive step, the invention according to claims 13-16 and 24-26 also lacks an inventive step.

The invention according to claims 2-12 and 18-21 relates to, for example, the representation of the system and the displaying of the data. The invention according to claims 2-12 and 18-21 is not considered to involve an inventive step in the light of document D3.

The invention according to claim 23, i.e. a hand-held device for displaying the user interface and input means to said device, is also considered to lack an inventive step.

The invention according to claims 1-27 is considered to be industrially applicable.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/004177

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or content of the international application have been noted:

Claims 13 and 24 are identical.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/004177

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawing or on the question whether the claim are fully supported by the description, are made:

Independent claims 13, 24, 25 and 26 must, in spite of the fact that they are referring to the method claims, define the necessary technical features of the system, the database and the website for realizing the method.

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record.

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☒ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☒ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☒ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☒ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.